



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,068	10/04/2006	Jung Hoon Lee	05-473-B	3994
20306	7590	01/21/2009		
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP			EXAMINER	
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			AMIRMOOKRI, JALALEDDIN	
32ND FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606			4182	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/21/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/561,068	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> JALELEDDIN AMIRMOOKRI	<b>Art Unit</b> 4182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 October 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DS/06)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Status***

1. This is in response to application filed on October 4, 2006 in which claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaudry et al. (US Patent No. 6,577,616) in view of Akao et al. (US Patent No. 7,123,913).

**Regarding claim 1,** Chaudry et al. teaches that a radical handoff method for resynchronizing a traffic cell site modem (CSM) to a new traffic and positioning a search window so that a mobile station's energy again falls into the center of the range available to the traffic search window (as described in column 9, lines 6-17). Each access CSM is assigned to respective search windows and has a particular search

window size parameter and search start offset parameter (as described in column 5, lines, 39-48, and column 6, lines, 18-20).

Chaudry et al. fails to teach that a target base station sets a searching area wider than a reference searching area in view of an error in the round trip delay value.

However Akao et al. teaches that a control block searches for a pilot signal by using a search window having a width greater than a search window specification contained in the instruction or the search window used for the soft handoff instruction (as described in column 2, lines 12-25). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chaudry et al. to widen the search window for the pilot signal as described by Akao et al. in order to improve the probability of finding the pilot and hence provide a more reliable handoff and a more robust system.

**Regarding claim 2,** Chaudry et al. teaches if the mobile station has not been acquired at the step S3, the method further comprises the step of reallocating reverse traffic channels such that each of the reverse traffic channels covers its corresponding sub-area and returning to the step 3 (step S5) (as described in column 6, lines, 1-17).

**Regarding claim 3,** Chaudry et al. teaches that when allocating the reverse traffic channels at the step S2, the search center offsets and search window sizes, which are parameters of the reverse traffic channels, are set by the respective sub-areas such that the search window sizes partly overlap each other so as to cover the searching area thoroughly (as described in column 5, lines, 66-67 and column 6, lines, 1-17).

**Regarding claim 4**, Chaudry et al. teaches that the search window size of the each reverse traffic channel is set to have a size sufficient to receive a multi-path of a base station cell coverage (as described in column 9, lines, 28-31).

### ***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JALALEDDIN AMIRMOOKRI whose telephone number is (571)270-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5m EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benny Tieu can be reached on (571)272-7490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/561,068  
Art Unit: 4182

Page 5

01/08/09

/Benny Q Tieu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4182